

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
AUSTIN DIVISION**

STEPHAN B. EPSTEIN; MARILYN EPSTEIN,	§	
	§	
Plaintiffs,	§	
V.	§	
	§	A-15-CV-00357-LY-ML
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC,	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Motion for Extension of Time to Obtain Legal Counsel and Extension of Time to Submit a Proposed Scheduling Order [Dkt. #32], filed November 5, 2015; Defendant's Proposed Scheduling Order [Dkt. #35], filed November 9, 2015; and Defendant's Motion to Dismiss [Dkt. #36] filed November 9, 2015.

Having considered the motions and the case file as a whole, the Magistrate Court enters the following:

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to File Motion for Extension of Time to Obtain Legal Counsel and Extension of Time to Submit a Proposed Scheduling Order [Dkt. #32] is GRANTED. The Clerk of this Court is directed to file Plaintiffs' Motion for Extension of Time to Obtain Legal Counsel and Extension of Time to Submit a Proposed Scheduling Order, attached as Exhibit A to the Motion for Leave.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion for Extension of Time to Obtain Legal Counsel and Extension of Time to Submit a Proposed Scheduling Order is GRANTED in PART and DENIED in PART. As discussed in the hearing held November 5, 2015, Plaintiffs' request for an extension of time to find an attorney is granted until **Monday, December 14, 2015**; no further extension is authorized by this Order. The grant of this limited extension does not have

the effect of “abating all issues” in this case, as requested in the Motion for Leave [Dkt. #32]. Except for the specific extensions noted below, the case shall proceed unabated while Plaintiffs seek new counsel and Plaintiffs will be expected to respond pro se to any deadlines that may run before they obtain counsel. Plaintiffs were advised in open court on November 5, 2015, at the time they terminated their prior counsel’s representation, that their choice would not delay these proceedings and they might have to respond to material filings pro se. Therefore,

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ Response to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss [Dkt. #36] will be due on or before **Wednesday, December 30, 2015**.

IT IS ORDERED that the parties have until **Monday, December 21, 2015** to submit a joint agreed proposed scheduling order.

These deadlines are ordered without regard to whether Plaintiffs are represented by counsel or continuing pro se.

SIGNED November 12, 2015.



---

MARK LANE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE